

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 8, 10 - 16 and 19 - 31 are pending in the present application. Claims 9, 17 and 18 are canceled. Claim 9 is being canceled by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the office action, the drawing is objected to because it fails to show a logic device and a coupler. Applicants are amending FIG. 1 to show a logic device 32, and amending the specification to identify logic device 32. Applicants are amending the claims to delete the recital of the coupler, as it does not appear to be necessary for patentability. A withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

On page 5 of the office action, claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicants are amending claim 8 to address this rejection. A withdrawal of the section 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 1 - 16 and 19 - 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0016891 to Hagino, hereinafter "the Hagino publication"). Applicants are clarifying an aspect of claim 1 that is not disclosed by the Hagino publication.

Claim 1 provides for a method that includes, *inter alia*, storing data in a configuration device, wherein the data comprises behavior or function description data for an intelligent unit, and wherein the data is transmitted from the configuration device to a logic device that processes the data for configuration of the intelligent unit. The application as filed discloses this aspect of claim 1, for example, at page 9, line 14.

The Hagino publication describes a control system comprising at least a host controller and a plurality of field devices which are connected via a transmission line thereby constituting a network, wherein the field devices belonging, for example, to an automation apparatus (cf. paragraph 2 and 3).

The control system comprises a plurality of connectors for connecting the plurality of field devices to the transmission line, wherein each connector has a network ID representing the position of the respective connector in the network (cf. paragraphs 8, 28, 30). In addition, the control system comprises a node address creating unit for generating node addresses based on the network IDs (cf. paragraphs 8, 24, 30).

In the Hagino publication, pursuant to one implementation, the node address is derived from the connector's network ID and field devices' device ID, wherein the device ID is different for each type of field device (cf. paragraphs 27, 28, 30). Each connector has a DIP switch by means of which the connector's network ID is settable and storable (cf. paragraph 34). Each field device has a communication CPU which reads the network ID from the DIP switch, determines the device ID of the field device, and based on both IDs calculates a node address (cf. paragraphs 35, 54). By use of the specific node address a communication between the controller and the respective field device can be carried out. Due to the same device ID field, devices of the same type are easily interchangeable, and communication is possible further on by use of the same node address as before (cf. paragraph 45).

Furthermore, the Hagino publication proposes that a plurality of programs is stored in a field device. The required program is selected in dependence on the network ID of the connector to which the field device is connected. By that, one field device can combine several field device types and hence have a higher versatility (cf. paragraph 74).

Pursuant to another implementation in the Hagino publication, to reduce the cost of a field device, the communication CPU for calculating the node address is not located in the field device but in the connector (cf. paragraphs 78, 79).

However, even if the Hagino publication describes several possibilities, the Hagino publication neither discloses nor suggests storing data in a configuration device, wherein the data comprises **behavior or function description data for an intelligent unit**, and wherein the data is transmitted from the configuration device to a logic device that processes the data for configuration of the intelligent unit, as recited in claim 1. Thus, the Hagino publication does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2 - 8, 10 - 16 and 19 - 31 depend from claim 1. By virtue of this dependence, claims 2 -

8, 10 - 16 and 19 - 31 are also novel over the Hagino publication.

Claim 9 is canceled. As such, the rejection thereof is rendered moot.


Applicants are requesting reconsideration and a withdrawal of the section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 - 16 and 19 - 31.

As mentioned above, Applicants are clarifying an aspect of claim 1 that is not disclosed by the Hagino publication, and amending claim 8 to address a section 112 rejection. In light of the amendment to claim 8, claim 9 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 10, 11, 14, 19 and 31 have been adapted for consistency with claims 1 and 8.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

July 1, 2009  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

  
Charles N.J. Ruggiero  
Reg. No. 28,468  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: 203-327-4500  
Fax: 203-327-6401